## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

STEVEN M. DENENBERG,	)
Plaintiff and Cross Plaintiff,	8:07CV150
vs.	) ) ORDER
BORKO B. DJORDJEVIC,	) )
Defendant and Third-Party Plaintiff,	, ) )
vs.	, )
JOHN OSAKA,	, )
Third-Party Defendant,	, ) ,
and	) )
DOCTORS SURGERY CENTER, d/b/a Surgeontothestars.com	) ) )
Third-Party Defendant and	, ) ,

This matter is before the court *sua sponte*.

On January 21, 2010, the court resolved two of the third-party defendants' motions to dismiss. **See** Filing No. 88. Further, the court notes there is no evidence in the record that the third-party plaintiff, Borko B. Djordjevic, has served the third-party defendant John Osaka. The court ordered Mr. Djordjevic to serve all third-party defendants by July 24, 2009. **See** Filing No. 63; **see** also Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) (establishing a 120-day time limit for service of process on a defendant in a civil case, absent a showing of good cause). Moreover, although this case has been on file since April 20, 2007, the parties have made no meaningful progress toward trial. Accordingly,

## IT IS ORDERED:

- 1. Borko B. Djordjevic shall have to **on or before February 12, 2010**, to file proof of service on John Osaka or show cause why John Osaka should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute.
- 2. The parties shall meet, confer and file a joint planning report in accordance with the requirement of <u>Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f)</u> **no later than February 12, 2010**. The court may impose sanctions on any party who fails to comply with this order pursuant to <u>Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(f)</u>.

DATED this 27th day of January, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

s/Thomas D. Thalken
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>\*</sup>This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.